



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,778	02/27/2002	Melissa W. Dunn	MS# 300222.1 (MSFT 4969.1)	1273
321	7590	09/19/2005		EXAMINER
SENNIGER POWERS LEAVITT AND ROEDEL ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE 16TH FLOOR ST LOUIS, MO 63102			PATEL, CHIRAG R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/084,778	DUNN, MELISSA W.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Chirag R. Patel	2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

697

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, see pages 1-6, filed July 12, 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-48 under 35 USC § 102 and 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly found prior art. A discussion of these references is presented below.

***Claim Objections***

Claim 20 objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1-19 describe a method. Claim 20 describe a structure performing the method. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter et al. - hereinafter Ginter - (US 2002/0112171) in view of Levergood et al. - hereinafter Levergood - (US 5,708,780).

As per claim 1, Ginter discloses the method of managing access by a client to user-specific information maintained in connection with a plurality of services, the method comprising:

maintaining a plurality of items of user-specific information; ([0017],[0043])

obtaining a plurality of client access requests directed to accessing the plurality of items of user-specific information maintained in the more than one of the plurality of services, said plurality of access requests being translated from a task request that requires the client to access the plurality of items of user-specific information in order to complete the task request; ([0060])

determining if the client has consent to access one of the plurality of items of user-specific information required by the client to complete the task request; ([0216])

filling the plurality of client access requests if the client has permission to access each of the plurality of items of user-specific information in the more than one of the plurality of services ([0216])

Ginter fails to disclose obtaining consent from a party having authority to grant access , if the client lacks access. Levergood discloses selectively obtaining consent, from a party having authority to grant access to the client, for the client to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information if the client lacks consent as a function of said determining; and (Col 6 lines 36-57) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to obtain consent from a party having authority to grant access , if the client lacks access in the disclosure of

Ginter. The motivation for doing do would have been to obtain a valid SID. (Col 5 lines 42-65)

As per claim 2, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 1, and Ginter discloses initiating the task request requiring the client to access the plurality of items of user-specific information in order to complete the task request; (Col 5 lines 42-65)

and translating the task request into the plurality of client access requests to complete the task request. ([0216])

As per claim 3, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 2, and Ginter discloses wherein selectively obtaining consent for the client to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information comprises:

identifying the task request, ([0935])  
discloses placing the identified task request in a task queue; and ([0935])  
displaying a consent menu to the identified party with authority, said consent menu prompting the identified party to grant or deny consent for the client to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent to access. ([0197])

Ginter fails to disclose obtaining consent from a party having authority to grant access , if the client lacks access. Levergood discloses identifying a party having authority to grant access to the client, for the client to access the one of the plurality of

items of user-specific information if the client lacks consent as a function of said determining; and (Col 6 lines 36-57) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to obtaining consent from a party having authority to grant access , if the client lacks access in the disclosure of Ginter. The motivation would have been to obtain a valid SID. (Col 5 lines 42-65)

As per claim 4, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3 and Ginter discloses wherein the identified party with authority to grant consent is the user of the plurality of services offered by the web-services provider and wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises displaying the consent menu to the user. ([0197]).

As per claim 5, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3 and Ginter discloses wherein the identified party with authority to grant consent is an owner of the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent to access and wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises displaying the consent menu to the owner. ([1078]).

As per claim 6, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method claim 5. Ginter discloses wherein the owner is the user of the plurality of services and wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises displaying the consent menu to the user. ([0197])

As per claim 7, Ginter / Levergood disclose discloses the method of claim 3 and Ginter discloses wherein the user of the plurality of services is a managed user and the identified party with authority to grant consent is a manager of the managed user and wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises displaying the consent menu to the manager of the managed user. ([1078])

As per claim 8, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3 and Ginter discloses wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises:

displaying an indication of the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent to access; ([1961] – [1964])

displaying an identity of the client; and ([0218])

displaying an intended use of the client of the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent to access. ([1961] – [1964])

As per claim 9, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 8 and Ginter discloses wherein displaying a consent menu to the identified party further comprises displaying a method of access requested by the client to complete the initiated task request. ([0197],[2181])

As per claim 10, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 8 and Ginter discloses wherein displaying a consent menu to the identified party further comprises

displaying an indication of a status of each of the plurality of client access requests translated from the task request. ([1806])

As per claim 11, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 8 and Ginter discloses wherein displaying a consent menu to the identified party further comprises displaying an indication of a status of each of the plurality of client access requests translated from the task request. ([0197])

As per claim 12, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3, and Ginter discloses identifying the plurality of client access requests to complete the task request, and identifying the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent to access. ([0196],[0197], [0216])

As per claim 13, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3, and Ginter discloses

providing a consent acceptance message being indicative of whether the identified party granted consent for the client to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent; and ([1346])

updating an access control list associated with the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent if the consent acceptance message indicates that the identified party granted consent, whereby upon updating

said access control list, the client has consent to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information ([0627])

As per claim 14, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 13 and Ginter discloses further comprising removing the identified task from the task queue if the consent acceptance message indicates that the identified party granted consent. ([0935],[1112])

As per claim 15, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method claim 13, and Ginter discloses the method of claim 13 further comprising transmitting a consent success message to the client, said consent success message being indicative of whether the identified party granted consent for the client to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent. ([1346])

As per claim 16, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 13, and Ginter discloses wherein updating the access control list further comprises setting a time limit in which the client has consent to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information. ([1574])

As per claim 17, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3, and Ginter discloses wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party displaying an

invitation to allow the client enjoy a one-time only access to the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent. ([1153])

As per claim 18, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3, and Ginter discloses wherein selectively obtaining consent for the client to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information farther comprises sending an alert message to the party with authority to grant consent, said alert message alerting the party with authority to grant consent that the client seeks access to the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent. ([1825])

As per claim 19, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3, and Ginter discloses the method of claim 3 further comprising:

providing a consent acceptance message being indicative of whether the identified party granted consent for the client to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent; ([1346])

granting consent to allow the client to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information if the consent acceptance message indicates that the indicated party granted consent. ([0627])

As per claim 20, Ginter discloses one or more computer-readable media having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in claim 1. ([0016])

As per claims 21-48, please see the discussion above as they relate to the same rationale and subject matter as above.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. These references are disclosed in the Notices of References cited page and teach numerous ways of user-centric consent management system and method. A close review of these references is recommended.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R. Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Art Unit: 2141

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see

<http://pairdirect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197

(toll free).



RUPAL DHARIA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER